

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/370,648	08/06/1999	ROBERT LINLEY MUIR	2741/FBR(031035-87549)	8315
26304	7590 08/26/2003			
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN 575 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585			EXAMINER HOTALING, JOHN M	
			3713	20
			DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003	0

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
	•	09/370,648	MUIR, ROBERT LINLEY
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit
	· ·	John M Hotaling II	3713
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
THE - External control	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC ensions of time may be available under the provisions of r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the reply specified above is less than thirty (30). Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a renication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt atory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON ill, by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <u>18 June 2003</u> .	
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2	b)☐ This action is non-final.	
3) 🗌			
Disposit	closed in accordance with the praction of Claims	ce under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.L	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
4) 🖂	Claim(s) 171-200 is/are pending in the	e application.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are	e withdrawn from consideration.	
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) 171-200 is/are rejected.		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
•	Claim(s) are subject to restricti tion Papers	on and/or election requirement.	•
9)[]	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.	
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a	a)⊡ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by t	he Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any object	ction to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed	on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ d	isapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are requ	uired in reply to this Office action.	
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to I	by the Examiner.	
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
,	Acknowledgment is made of a claim f	or foreign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)	D☐ All b)☐ Some * c)⊠ None of:		
	1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority d	ocuments have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority d		
*	 Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internation See the attached detailed Office action 	tional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
14) 🗌	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	r domestic priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application
	a) \square The translation of the foreign lang Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Attachme	-		
1) 🔀 Noti 2) 🔲 Noti	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pa	O-948) 5) Notice of I	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/370,648

Art Unit: 3713

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 171-200 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berg et al US Patent 5,779,545 in view of Schneier et al US Patent 5,871,398. Berg discloses all of the instant application with respect to the transferring of game information over a network and the use of a random number determining a game output. However, Berg lacks in disclosing that the medium where the game information (random number seed) is transferred to is a smart card or a smart card chip. Instead, Berg discloses in column 3 that the general manner of constructing a program to control a microprocessor so as to permit a user to play various games and output results is well-known in the art. Further, motivation to provide other communication means can be found in column 3 lines 44-46 where the communications device 114 can be any of a plurality of devices known to those of skill in the art for receiving data communication and placing it in a format suitable for transmission to the microprocessor 108. In an analogous invention to Schneier a gaming machine that enables play of the machine on a remote computer by transferring authenticatagle game authorization messages (AGAM) to the game machine. Schneier discloses in column 14 lines 12-33 the AGAM

Art Unit: 3713

may be written to memory in the smart card, the player puts the smart card in the machine and the machine reads the message. Schneier also discloses other methods of transferring AGAM to the machine such as a modern. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to combine Berg and Schneier in order to have a distributed game system where the random number seeds could be securely transferred to a game machine on a smart card. The motivation to combine the references as stated by Berg that the communications device 114 could be any of a plurality of devices known to those of skill in the art for receiving data communication and placing it in a format suitable for transmission to the microprocessor 108 which is what the smart card of Schneier does.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Walker et al '640 discloses a off line remote lottery system that uses smart cards with game chances

Belamant '898 discloses using a smart card to control a game

Application/Control Number: 09/370,648

Art Unit: 3713

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M Hotaling II whose telephone number is 703 305 0780. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30-6.

John M Hotaling II Primary Examiner August 19, 2003 Page 4